UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT **DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

IN RE: Bair Hugger Forced Air Warming

Products Liability Litigation

MDL No. 15-2666 (JNE/FLN)

PLAINTIFF

RAYMOND PERRY

VS.

3M COMPANY AND ARIZANT HEALTHCARE, INC.

MASTER SHORT FORM COMPLAINT AND JURY TRIAL **DEMAND**

1. Plaintiff, Raymond Perry, states and brings this civil action in MDL No. 15-2666, entitled In Re: Bair Hugger Forced Air Warming Products Liability Litigation. Plaintiff is filing this Short Form Complaint as permitted by Pretrial Order #8 of this Court.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Plaintiff, Raymond Perry, is a resident and citizen of the State of Louisiana and claims damages as set forth below.
 - 3. Jurisdiction is proper based upon diversity of Citizenship.
- 4. Proper Venue: The District Court in which remand trial is proper and where this Complaint would have been filed absent the direct filing order by this Court is the District of Minnesota.
 - 5. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 6. On or about June 8, 2021, Plaintiff underwent surgery during which the Bair Hugger Forced Air Warming system (hereinafter "Bair Hugger") was used during the course and scope of his left total knee arthroplasty ("TKA") at Abbeville General Hospital, in Abbeville, Louisiana, by Dr. Seth Rosenzweing.
- 7. Contaminants introduced into Plaintiff's open surgical wound as a direct and proximate result of use of the Bair Hugger during the subject surgery resulted in Plaintiff developing a periprosthetic joint infection ("PJI"), also known as a deep joint infection ("DJI"). The Pathogen was not identified.
- 8. As a result of Plaintiff's infection caused by the Bair Hugger, Plaintiff underwent corrective surgery on August 8, 2021, where the implant was removed, cleaned, and immediately reinserted during the corrective surgery at Abbeville General Hospital in Abbeville, Louisiana.

ALLEGATIONS AS TO INJURIES

X	INJURY TO HERSELF/HIMSELF
	INJURY TO THE PERSON REPRESENTED
	WRONGFUL DEATH
	SURVIVORSHIP ACTION
X	ECONOMIC LOSS

(a) Plaintiff claims damages as a result of:

9.

(b) Defendants, by their actions or inactions, proximately caused the injuries to Plaintiff.

DEFENDANT-SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS AND THEORIES OF RECOVERY

10.	The following	ng claims and allegations are asserted by Plaintiff and are herein
adopted by	reference:	
_X	<u></u>	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION - NEGLIGENCE;
_X	<u></u>	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION - STRICT LIABILITY;
	X	FAILURE TO WARN
	X	DEFECTIVE DESIGN AND MANUFACTURE
_X	<u></u>	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF EXPRESS
		WARRANTY;
_X		FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION- BREACH OF IMPLIED
		WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY LAW OF THE
		STATE OF LOUISIANA, LA. C.C. ART. § 2520, et seq.;
_X		FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION- VIOLATION OF THE
		MINNESOTA PREVENTION OF CONSUMER FRAUD
		ACT;
_X	<u> </u>	SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION – VIOLATION OF THE
		MINNESOTA DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES ACT;
_X	<u> </u>	SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION- VIOLATION OF THE
		MINNESOTA UNLAWFUL TRADE PRACTICES ACT;
<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION- VIOLATION OF THE
		MINNESOTA FALSE ADVERTISING ACT;

<u>X</u>	NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION- CONSUMER FRAUD
	AND/OR UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE TRADE
	PRACTICES UNDER LAW OF THE STATE OF
	LOUISIANA, LA. R.S. § 51:1401, et seq.;
<u>X</u>	TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – NEGLIGENT
	MISREPRESENTATION;
<u>X</u>	ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION- FRAUDULENT
	MISREPRESENTATION;
<u>X</u>	TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – FRAUDULENT
	CONCEALMENT;
	THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – LOSS OF
	CONSORTIUM; and
<u>X</u>	FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – UNJUST
	ENRICHMENT.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 1. For compensatory damages;
- 2. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- 3. Statutory damages and relief of the state whose laws will govern this action;
- 4. Costs and expenses of this litigation;
- 5. Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided by law;
- 6. Equitable relief in the nature of disgorgement;
- 7. Restitution of remedy Defendants' unjust enrichment; and

8. All other relief as the Court deems necessary, just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury as to all claims in Complaint so triable.

Dated: February 21, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

HODGES & FOTY, LLP By: /s/ David W. Hodges David W. Hodges dhodges@kennedyhodges.com 2 Greenway Plaza, Suite 250 Houston, TX 77046 Telephone: (713) 523-0001

Telephone: (713) 523-0001 Facsimile: (713) 523-1116

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF